FILED 1 Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857) (msobol@lchb.com) 2007 JAN 18 PM 4: 11 2 Allison S. Elgart (State Bar No. 241901) (aelgart@lchb.com) LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP ON MAN DESTRICT COURT THITRAL DIST, OF CALIF. SANTA AMA 3 4 Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008 5 6 Michael A. Caddell (admitted pro hac vice) (mac@caddellchapman.com)
George Y. Niño (State Bar No. 144623) (gyn@caddellchapman.com)
CADDELL & CHAPMAN 7 8 9 1331 Lamar, Suite 1070 Houston, Texas 77010-3027 Telephone: (713) 751-0400 10 11 Facsimile: (713) 751-0906 12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 13 [Additional Counsel listed on signature page] 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 15 SOUTHERN DIVISION 16 17 JOSE L. ACOSTA, JR., ROBERT Case No. SA CV 06-5060 DOC (MLGx) 18 RANDALL, and BERTRAM **DECLARATION OF STUART T.** ROBINSON, individually, and on **ROSSMAN IN SUPPORT OF** 19 **OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'** behalf of all others similarly 20 APPLICATION FOR PRELIMINARY situated, APPROVAL 21 Plaintiffs. 22 ٧. DOCKETED ON CM 23 TRANS UNION, LLC, et al., and 24 FEB - 5 2007 DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, 25 Defendants. 26 27 28 DECL. OF STUART T. ROSSMAN ISO OPP. TO 585720.1 APPLICATION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

I, Stuart T. Rossman, declare and state:

2 3

could and would testify competently thereto if called upon to do so.

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28

- I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and
- I am one of the attorneys working on behalf of the Class in the White/Hernandez litigation, and a senior litigator at the National Consumer Law Center. I submit this Declaration to confirm certain statements by Michael Caddell in his Declaration in Support of Opposition to the Plaintiffs' Motion for An Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Settlement.
- 3. I was present at and participated in the September 14, 2006 mediation with Justice Trotter. Early in this session, when meeting separately with the members of the White/Hernandez team, Justice Trotter told us that he believed counsel for TransUnion chose the Acosta lawyers to negotiate with for a national class action settlement of the FCRA claims, because TransUnion's counsel thought they "could get a better deal" from the Acosta counsel than from us.
- 4. Justice Trotter also told us that he had no opinion as to the "fairness or adequacy" of the proposed TransUnion settlement agreement. Justice Trotter reiterated that point ("I have no opinion as to the fairness or adequacy of the settlement") with respect to what was by then a proposed TransUnion/Equifax settlement in a telephone call on September 26 in which I participated with our cocounsel, Michael Sobol and Michael Caddell.
- 5. During the mediation, the White/Hernandez team made an effort to bring Acosta counsel into our team in order to attempt to obtain a better settlement for the class. We did so despite misgivings about Acosta counsel based on the inadequacy of the settlement they had agreed on. We offered to place Mr. Sherman on our steering committee, and to allocate fees based on our respective contributions to the class, with the Acosta team being credited for all of the time and expenses incurred in their pursuit of the Acosta and Pike cases. The emphasis of our proposal was that a better settlement could be obtained for the Class if